

| | | | |
|---|--------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--|
| Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary | Application No. 10/669,574 | Applicant(s) PUVVADA ET AL. | |
| | Examiner Necholus Ogden | Art Unit 1751 | |

All Participants:

(1) Necholus Ogden.

(2) Alan Bornstein.

Date of Interview: 2 March 2004

Status of Application: _____

(3) _____

(4) _____

Time: _____

Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

103

Claims discussed:

1-2

Prior art documents discussed:

He et al or Ross et al or McFann et al or Kinsman et al

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.


(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: It was agreed to delete the word "optionally" from component (d) and include the step of forming pelets in the bar process of the claimed invention. The prior art does not teach or suggest this step as claimed. Accordingly, the claims are allowable over the art of record..